



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/755,450	01/13/2004	Igor Garrievich Muttik	03.047.01	1086
7590	05/22/2007		EXAMINER	
Zilka-Kotab, PC P.O. Box 721120 San Jose, CA 95172-1120			SANDOVAL, KRISTIN D	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2132	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/22/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/755,450	MUTTIK, IGOR GARRIEVICH	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Kristin D. Sandoval	2132	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 January 2004.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-51 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-51 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 13 January 2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
    1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
    3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1-51 are pending.

### ***Drawings***

The informal drawings are not of sufficient quality to permit examination. Accordingly, replacement drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to this Office action. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action.

Applicant is given a TWO MONTH time period to submit new drawings in compliance with 37 CFR 1.81. Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). Failure to timely submit replacement drawing sheets will result in ABANDONMENT of the application.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 1-17 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. A computer program product and code is reasonably interpreted by one of ordinary skill as just software, it is a system of software, *per se*. In these claims the function of the program code is just software not any hardware. *Warmerdam*, 33 F.3d at 1360, 31 USPQ2d at 1759. When functional descriptive material is recorded on some computer-readable

medium it becomes structurally and functionally interrelated to the medium and will be statutory in most cases since use of technology permits the function of the descriptive material to be realized. Compare *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 1583-84, 32 USPQ2d 1031, 1035 (Fed. Cir. 1994) (claim to data structure stored on a computer readable medium that increases computer efficiency held statutory) and *Warmerdam*, 33 F.3d at 1360-61, 31 USPQ2d at 1759 (claim to computer having a specific data structure stored in memory held statutory product-by-process claim) with *Warmerdam*, 33 F.3d at 1361, 31 USPQ2d at 1760 (claim to a data structure per se held nonstatutory). Data structures not claimed as embodied in computer-readable media are descriptive material per se and are not statutory because they are not capable of causing functional change in the computer. See, e.g., *Warmerdam*, 33 F.3d at 1361, 31 USPQ2d at 1760 (claim to a data structure per se held nonstatutory). Such claimed data structures do not define any structural and functional interrelationships between the data structure and other claimed aspects of the invention which permit the data structure's functionality to be realized. In contrast, a claimed computer-readable medium encoded with a data structure defines structural and functional interrelationships between the data structure and the computer software and hardware components which permit the data structure's functionality to be realized, and is thus statutory. Similarly, computer programs code claimed as computer instructions per se, i.e., the descriptions or expressions of the programs, are not physical "things." They are neither computer components nor statutory processes, as they are not "acts" being performed. Such claimed computer programs do not define any structural and functional interrelationships between the computer program and other claimed elements of a computer which permit the computer program's functionality to be realized. Accordingly, it is important to distinguish claims that define descriptive material per se from claims that define statutory inventions. So, it does not appear that a claim reciting software with functional descriptive material falls within any of the categories of patentable subject matter set forth in § 101.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

Art Unit: 2132

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 1-51 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The term "more strongly" in claims 1, 18, 35, 7, 24 and 41 is a relative term which renders the claim indefinite. The term "more strongly" is not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention. It is unclear how an external program call could be more strongly associated with malicious code and since it is a relative term it is uncertain what the association is stronger than.

Claims 7, 24 and 41 recite the limitation "wherein score values within said set of rules associated with said secondary set of one or more external program calls" in lines 1-2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Previously there are no rule sets associated with the secondary set of external program calls.

#### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Art Unit: 2132

3. Claims 1, 2, 8-10, 13, 14, 17, 18, 19, 25-27, 30, 34, 35, 36, 42-44, 47, 48 and 51 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by van der Made (Made), U.S. Patent No. 7,093,239.

As per claims 1, 2, 18, 17, 35 and 36:

Made discloses a computer program product operable to detect malicious computer program activity, comprising:

logging code operable to log a stream of external program calls (10:18-29);

primary set identifying code operable to identify, within said stream of external program calls, a primary set of one or more external program calls matching one or more rules indicative of malicious computer program activity from among a set of rules;

secondary set identifying code operable to identify, within said stream, at least one secondary set of one or more external program calls associated with said primary set of one or more external program calls; and

modifying code operable to modify said set of rules such that said at least one secondary set of one or more external program calls are more strongly associated with malicious computer program activity (6:12-24 and 11:46-60)

wherein one of said at least one secondary set of one or more external program calls precedes said primary set of one or more external program calls within said stream of external program calls (6:12-24).

As per claims 8-10, 25-27 and 42-22:

Made discloses a computer program product wherein said set of rules include at least one of: one or more pattern matching rules; and one or more regular expression rules, wherein said set of rules are responsive to ordering of external program calls and said modifying code

dynamically adapts said set of rules in response to detected streams of external program calls performing malicious computer program activity (5:16-39).

As per claims 13, 30 and 47:

Made discloses a computer program product wherein said stream of external program calls are logged following emulation of execution of a computer program (5:16-39).

As per claims 14, 31 and 48:

Made discloses a computer program product wherein said set of rules is modified to include a new rule corresponding to said secondary set of one or more external program calls, said new rule thereafter being used in addition to other rules within said set of rules (11:46-59).

As per claims 17, 34 and 51:

Made discloses a computer program product wherein said set of rules is subject to a validity check after modification to determine if said set of rules is more effectively detecting malicious computer program activity (12:26-41).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2132

4. Claims 3-5, 20-22 and 37-39 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Made, U.S. Patent No. 7,093,239 as applied to claims 1, 18 and 35 above and further in view of Khazan et al. (Khazan), U.S. PG-PUB 2005/0108562.

As per claims 3, 20 and 37:

Khazan substantially teaches a computer program product wherein said external program calls are application program interface calls to an operating system (paragraph 0042).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to utilize the invention of Khazan in combination with the invention of Made because executing the malicious code detector of Khazan in a simulation mode would allow the executables being tested to display the malicious code symptoms without actually hurting the computer system it resides on as taught by Khazan (paragraph 0111).

As per claims 4, 5, 21, 22, 38 and 39:

Khazan substantially teaches a computer program product wherein each of said external program calls has one or more characteristics compared against said set of rules, wherein said one or more characteristics include: a call name; a return address; one or more parameter values; and one or more returned results (paragraph 0042).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to utilize the invention of Khazan in combination with the invention of Made because executing the malicious code detector of Khazan in a simulation mode would allow the executables being tested to display the malicious code symptoms without actually hurting the computer system it resides on as taught by Khazan (paragraph 0111).

Art Unit: 2132

5. Claims 6-7, 23-24 and 40-41 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Made as applied to claims 1, 18 and 35 above, and further in view of Obrecht et al. (Obrecht), U.S. PG-PUB 2004/0064736.

As per claims 6-7, 23-24 and 40-41:

Obrecht substantially teaches a computer program product wherein rules within said set of rules specify score values of external program calls having predetermined characteristics and a set of one or more external program calls is identified as corresponding to malicious computer program activity if said set of one or more external program calls has a combined score value exceeding a threshold level and the score level associated with the secondary set is increased to more strongly associate the secondary set with malicious program activity (paragraph 0039).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to utilize the score and weight system of Obrecht with the emulation system of Made in order to create a more robust computer system as taught by Obrecht (paragraph 0056).

6. Claims 11-12, 28-29 and 45-46 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Made as applied to claim 1, 18 and 35 above, and further in view of Judge, U.S. Patent No. 7,096,498.

As per claims 11-12, 28-29 and 45-46:

Judge substantially teaches a computer program product wherein at least changes within said set of rules are transmitted to one or more remote computer such that said one or more remote computers can use said modified set of rules without having to suffer said malicious computer program activity (abstract) and to a rules supplier (20:5-34).

Art Unit: 2132

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to propagate the rules to other systems in order to get a global view of traffic patterns as disclosed in Judge (6:58-7:10).

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kristin D. Sandoval whose telephone number is 571-272-7958. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 8:00-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gilberto Barron can be reached on 571-272-3799. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Kristin D Sandoval  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2132

KDS



Benjamin E. Tanner  
Examiner Art 2132